

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

New claims are submitted herewith for examination. Claim 89 recites “generating at least two of the following three pieces of information for said particular location: positional information; content information; and metadata information.” The significance of applicants’ approach to generating and using such a bookmark is discussed in the application as filed.

There are many cases where a bookmark system that utilizes only positional information, such as URI and an elapsed time, such as that used by conventional bookmarks, may not be valid. For example, if a bookmark were generated during the preview of multimedia content broadcast, the bookmark would not be valid for viewing a full version of the broadcast. If a bookmark were saved during live Internet broadcast, the bookmark would not be valid for viewing an edited version of the live broadcast. Further, if a user wanted to access the bookmarked multimedia content from another site that also provides the content, even the positional information such as URI would be not be valid.

Publication No. 2002/0069218, paragraph 176.

It is submitted that by providing a bookmark with two of the three pieces of information recited in claim 89 overcomes the problems inherent in the prior art.

The other independent claims, claims 93 and 99, contain similar recitations. Support may be found in the application as filed, e.g., paragraphs 252 – 264.

An early, favorable Office action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske
Reg. No. 29,688
Jones Day
500 Grant Street, Suite 3100
One Mellon Center
Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 15219
(412) 394-9531
(412) 394-7959 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicants